OSU Working Papers in Linguistics 52, 159-170

Tracing the Origins of the Slavic Imperfective be-Future

Marika Whaley

1. Introduction

For over one hundred years, scholars have debated the origin and development of the Slavic future constructions with *byti* 'be'. This construction is found in most of the modern Slavic languages, including Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian, Polish, Kashubian, Czech, Slovak, Slovene, and some dialects of Croatian. Whereas the earliest attested Slavic languages show future constructions formed with auxiliaries such as 'want', 'have', and 'begin' in combination with an infinitive, many modern Slavic languages express imperfective futurity through an auxiliary derived from the future form of *byti* 'be/become' in combination with either an imperfective infinitive or resultative participle (also called the *l*-participle). The question of how these previously used future expressions were replaced by a 'be(come)'-type future (hereafter shortened to "be-future") has been addressed in many studies, yielding a multitude of explanations. These earlier studies, however, can be shown to be inadequate. Many propose a solution that cannot be reconciled with all available data, and none have been able to take advantage of recent general linguistic research on historical syntax and grammaticalization, the development of words into markers of grammatical categories.

The goal of this paper is to present an evaluation of the scholarship that has been produced on this topic, and to demonstrate how an application of more modern theories of diachronic morphosyntax reveals the shortcomings of this scholarship. This evaluation is an essential precursor to presenting a new, more satisfactory analysis of how the Slavic be-future developed into such a widely used construction.

The paper begins with a description of methodology. In the next sections, the paper will employ that methodology to address the arguments of the two major approaches to this problem. A paper of this size cannot begin to consider every relevant source that has been produced. Instead, individual works have been chosen on the basis of two criteria: first, the

popularity of the work, i.e. how often it has been cited by others as an acceptable explanation of the question; and second, the testability of the hypothesis presented.

2. Elaboration of the Problem

Many Slavic languages express imperfective futurity by means of an analytic construction formed by the future form of the verb 'be' plus an imperfective infinitival or participial complement. Table 1 gives examples of this construction from several of these languages.

West Slavic	Czech	*ja budu psáti*
	Polish	*ja będę pisać / ja będę pisał*
East Slavic	Russian	*ja budu pisat'*
	Ukrainian	*ja budu pisati*
South Slavic	Slovene	*ja bom písal*

Table 1. The expression 'I will write' in selected Slavic languages.

The combination of the future auxiliary *budu*[1] with verbal infinitives is not found in the oldest attested Slavic language, Old Church Slavonic (OCS), nor does it exist in most of the modern South Slavic languages: literary Serbo-Croatian, Macedonian, or Bulgarian. Thus, we must assume that it did not exist as an available construction in the reconstructed proto-language, Common Slavic, but rather appeared after individual Slavic languages began to distinguish themselves.

Each language that has the be-future marks a different date for the earliest attestations of the construction. The earliest appearances of a be-type future construction in Slavic are found in Czech, which shows examples dating from the fourteenth century (Lehr-Spławiński 1957:141). In Polish, the construction is found in the earliest texts, dating from the second half of the fourteenth century, but a lack of extant texts from any earlier period makes it difficult to establish a definitive *terminus post quem*. For Slovene and Croatian, early data are extremely scarce; the earliest attestations in both areas are from the mid-sixteenth century (Rösler 1952:120, 114, respectively).

Texts in the East Slavic languages show the construction appearing later than in West Slavic, although the data are unclear. Belarusian and Ukrainian texts, for example, show the be-future consistently only from the fifteenth or even sixteenth centuries; there may be, however, isolated examples from earlier.

The construction begins to appear in texts of Russian provenance relatively late. Examples are attested for western Russian texts from the late fifteenth century, but this area was heavily influenced by Polish and thus we cannot assume a comparably early development of the be-future in so-called "Great", or central, Russian. Only in the eighteenth century does the be-future become the overwhelmingly dominant means of expressing imperfective futurity in Russian (Kuznecov 1959:246).

Prior to the appearance of the be-future, Slavic texts attest several strategies for expressing imperfective futurity. We find constructions formed with auxiliaries based on the verbs 'want', 'have', and 'begin' plus an imperfective infinitive. In Ukrainian, the

[1] For the purposes of this paper, *budu* should be understood as a cover form for all inflected forms of the future auxiliary in all of the languages that employ the be-future construction.

'have'-type future developed into a grammaticalized future suffix that attaches to the infinitive. This construction coexists with the be-future in the modern literary language (Rusanivs'kij 1971:250).

There also existed in Common Slavic a system of "perfect" tenses, which were formed with tense forms of the verb 'be' in combination with the *l*-participle, or resultative participle, of verbs of either aspect. One of these constructions, the future perfect, was formed with the same auxiliary later used with the be-future, *budu*. Polish and Kashubian, moreover, have developed a variant of the be-future that is formally identical to the future perfect, although it is formed with participles of imperfective verbs only.

We can conclude from this data that the be-future was not inherited from Common Slavic, and none of the earlier constructions expressing futurity can be seen as a source from which the be-future developed directly through regular phonological or morphological change. Thus, scholars have sought to explain the development of the be-future as either the result of borrowing from outside of Slavic, or as a result of innovations within the Slavic languages themselves.

3. Methodology

In recent years, much work has been done in linguistics that has immediate relevance for an analysis of the development of the Slavic be-future. The nature of the future as a verb tense, the process by which lexical items in a language come to be used as grammatical markers, and the mechanisms of syntactic change are subjects which have received considerable attention within the last two decades. This primarily theoretical work provides an essential background for evaluating the viability of theories regarding the origins of the be-future. By comparing the situation in Slavic to what is found among all of the world's language, it becomes possible to assess whether a particular description of the development of the be-future is "reasonable", both typologically as well as in terms of how we understand language change.

In this section, I will present a brief overview of the theoretical framework upon which this study is based.

3.1 The Nature of the Future Tense

Perhaps the most fundamental assertion linguists make regarding the future tense is about its place in the tense system of language. Future tense is used to describe events that take place after the moment of speech, and thus, as Ultan (1978:105) points out, the future contains a degree of uncertainty that separates it from other tenses. As a verbal category, the future tense contains elements of both modality and temporality.

The unique semantics of the future tense is often reflected in a unique form. Russian, for example, has the analytic (periphrastic) imperfective be-future while other tenses are formed synthetically, through the addition of various suffixes. Indeed, according to Bybee and Dahl (1989:56), slightly more than half of the world's languages employ an analytic future tense construction.

This conclusion has direct relevance to the problem of the Slavic be-future, because some scholars have justified their arguments regarding the development of the construction on the assumption that its formal isolation implies a non-Slavic origin. Bonfante (1950:96), for example, argues that Slavic must have borrowed its periphrastic future constructions from Greek, since the Slavic languages had no native analogue upon which such a future

could have been modeled. By analyzing the formation of future tense expressions from a cross-linguistic perspective, however, one concludes that analytic future tense constructions, including those found in Slavic languages, are not typologically marked.

3.2 Grammaticalization

In recent years, there has been a great deal of attention paid to grammaticalization, a theory which attempts to define the process by which lexical items come to be used as markers of grammatical categories. The development of future tense constructions has been a fruitful source of data for scholars interested in grammaticalization, because future markers (whether auxiliaries or suffixes) are often young enough that their lexical origins have not been obscured by subsequent linguistic changes.[2]

While there is some debate regarding the validity and importance of many of the claims of grammaticalization theory, the literature has a great advantage in providing a broad, cross-linguistic perspective on future constructions. In this capacity, grammaticalization theory provides useful data against which one can evaluate the Slavic be-future.

For example, some scholars have argued that the semantic similarity between the Slavic be-future auxiliary and the German future auxiliary *werden* indicates that the two future constructions must share a single source.[3] Bybee et al. (1991:18), however, demonstrate that this is not necessarily valid. Their cross-linguistic study of future expressions shows only a very small number of possible lexical sources for future markers, increasing the probability that coincidence is at work when two genetically unrelated languages share a similar future construction.

3.3 Mechanisms of Syntactic Change

The development of the Slavic be-future concerns matters of syntactic change, an area which is relatively unexplored in Slavistics. Thus, many of the descriptions of the development of the be-future have been written from a very narrow perspective that does not attempt to compare or reconcile Slavic data with data from other languages.

Recent scholarship in general linguistics has produced important works in this area. One of them, Harris and Campbell 1995, seeks to define the basic mechanisms of syntactic change. Of these, two are relevant for this study: reanalysis and extension.

Reanalysis, as defined by Harris and Campbell (ibid.:61) is a type of change which affects underlying structure without producing a visible change in surface structure. In the case of the Slavic be-future, one can speculate that the change of the verb 'be(come)' into a purely grammatical marker of futurity is a type of reanalysis.

Extension, on the other hand, is a change that affects surface structure (ibid.:97). This concept is similar to analogy, although Harris and Campbell draw a distinction between them (ibid.:51). For Slavic, extension can be used to describe how the be-type future became the standard means of describing imperfective futurity.

By seeking to describe syntactic change in terms of these specific mechanisms, Harris and Campbell allow for a more systematic and consistent analysis of changes. In the case of the be-future, we shall see below that their theories are a useful tool for evaluating

---

[2] For a discussion on determining the age of a future construction, see Bybee et al. 1991.

[3] See section 4.2.1 for a more detailed discussion of this argument.

the feasibility of paths of development that have been proposed.

In the following sections, we turn to the main purpose of this paper: to evaluate the theories which have been proposed to describe the development of the be-future in Slavic.

4. Previous Scholarship: The Borrowing Hypothesis

Many scholars who have explored the nature and origin of the Slavic imperfective be-future have concluded that the construction arose as a result of the influence of a non-Slavic language. The work of Rösler (1952) provides the most detailed argument for this position and has been cited by several sources as the most convincing explanation for the presence of be-futures throughout Slavic.

4.1 The Slavic be-Future as a German Borrowing

Rösler (1952) acknowledges that the be-future cannot be traced back to Common Slavic. Moreover, he points out that as independent verbs both *werden* and *budu* express change-of-state meaning (although *budu* has since lost this meaning[4]). Given other evidence of German linguistic influence on Czech, and his position that a be-type future is typologically rare, Rösler argues that the Slavic be-future must have its origins as a borrowing from German.

Central to Rösler's argument is the question of chronology. He argues that since German developed its future construction with *werden* plus the infinitive in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, while the Czech be-future begins to be attested in the fourteenth century, there clearly existed a window of time large enough for the German construction to be adopted into Czech. Rösler estimates the time frame of the borrowing to be the late thirteenth century (ibid.:142).

In order to explain the presence of be-type futures across all of North Slavic territory, Rösler then postulates a successive sequence of borrowings from Czech into Polish, Polish into Belarusian and Ukrainian, and thence into Russian. Given that the first be-futures do not appear in Russian until the seventeenth century, Rösler argues that he has a sufficiently late endpoint to his proposed sequence of borrowings.

4.2 Counterarguments to the German-Borrowing Hypothesis

Rösler's hypothesis has provoked a great deal of discussion among scholars, and has among its supporters Cocron (1962), and apparently Vlasto (1988). There are serious flaws in his argument, however, many of which have been addressed in Kurz (1952), Křížková (1960), and Leiss (1985). This section discusses the most salient couter-arguments against Rösler, with an emphasis on recent conclusions drawn by grammaticalization theory as well as dialect studies.

4.2.1 The Perceived Rarity of a be-Type Future

Rösler's initial assumption regarding the development of the Slavic be-future is that because it shares the same lexical source as the German future, its origins must be linked to the German future. In other words, he finds it highly unlikely that these two similar futures developed independently of each other.

---

[4] In the interests of space, a discussion of the semantics of *budu* must be reserved for another time; for information regarding its earlier, change-of-state meaning, see Dostál 1954:147.

In order to assess the validity of Rösler's assumption, we must determine not only whether a be-type future is actually rare, but also whether there is such diversity in sources of future constructions that two similar constructions are likely to be related. In a series of cross-linguistic studies of the future tense, Bybee and Pagliuca (1987) examine a representative sample of the world's languages in order to analyze the most typical kinds of future tense formations. By their assessment, there are in fact only a small number of lexical sources for future tense constructions, and one of those sources is verbs of existence or coming into existence (ibid.:111). One sees this type of future , for example, in the Classical Latin future with the suffix *-b-*, and according to Ultan (1978:110), such futures are also found in Cuna, Upper Chinook, and some Celtic languages.

These data invalidate the assumption that the German and Slavic be-futures must be related. It does not, however, demonstrate that they are not related. A more detailed analysis of Rösler's theory, as well as the counterarguments against him, however, sheds more light on this question.

4.2.2 Reliability of Textual Evidence

In his presentation of evidence to support his claim, Rösler makes the mistake of relying on a single source of data to draw his conclusion: the date of the earliest attestation of a be-type future in each language. This is inadequate for several reasons. First, we cannot assume that the earliest extant text containing a particular linguistic feature is the earliest text which contained that feature. Many texts have not survived through the centuries to be available to us now. Second, many texts available to us have survived only in copies made a century or more later than the original. The process of copying the text may have resulted in contamination of the original language with newer linguistic material. Third, one must make a distinction between the language of written texts, which generally reflects a more conservative linguistic system, and the contemporaneous spoken language. Because of the gap between spoken and written variants of a language, textual evidence cannot indicate the absolute *terminus post quem* for the appearance of linguistic features; it can only indicate that the feature existed *at least as early* as the date of the text. This suggests that the origins of the be-future in a particular language must be found earlier than the first written attestation of the construction.

If we assume that such a time lag existed in the relationship of texts to the spoken language in the early Slavic languages, we begin to see flaws in Rösler's description of events. With only written attestations in mind, Rösler has drawn a picture of events that relies on a very narrow window of opportunity for a large number of independently occurring linguistic borrowings. Let us take an example. Rösler states that the earliest appearance of the be-future in Polish is in the middle of the fourteenth century, but places the entry of the construction into Czech in the middle to late thirteenth century. In essence, Rösler is suggesting that the construction appeared in Czech and managed to spread to dominance quickly enough to enter into Polish as a prestige borrowing in only one hundred years. Moreover, the construction managed to establish dominance in Polish quickly enough to be borrowed into western East Slavic within another hundred years. Such speed for a linguistic change involving syntax is highly improbable.

The example of Polish brings up another interesting problem with regards to establishing a chronology. Rösler has overlooked the fact that for Polish, the earliest extant texts are dated relatively late – from the mid-fourteenth century (Rospond 1971:36). We

can only speculate as to the composition of Old Polish before the earliest extant text, and we cannot know whether the be-future was newly borrowed in the fourteenth century or whether it had already been in use for a century or more.

4.2.3 Dialect Evidence from Ukrainian

The transmission of the be-future from Polish into the western languages of East Slavic, Belarusian and Ukrainian, is an especially problematic part of Rösler's hypothesis. Rösler (1952:144-5) argues that the borrowing of the be-future was simply one more instance of Polish exerting influence over Ukrainian However, the relationship between Polish and Ukrainian is far more complex than Rösler suggests. As Šerech (1952:348-9) argues, only after the sixteenth century was the general direction of influence from Polish into Ukrainian. During the earliest period of contact between Polish and Ukrainian peoples, from the tenth to the fourteenth centuries, Ukrainian influence on Polish was much more significant.

Data from modern Ukrainian dialects also suggest that Rösler's characterization of events is inaccurate. The Ukrainian dialect atlas (Zakrevska et al. 1988:II, map 244) reports that *budu* in combination with the *l*-participle (hereafter "*budu* + *l*") is found in a large area of southwestern Ukrainian dialects, extending from the Polish border in the west deep into the areas associated with the Dnister and Podillja dialect groups. Most of this area also uses *budu* with an infinitival complement ("*budu* + Inf.") as a variant, but there are significant islands around L'viv, Ternopil', and south of Xmel'nic'kyj where only *budu* + *l* is found.

According to Rösler, Polish influence on Ukrainian led to the latter's adoption of a *budu* + Inf. type future. The dialect map shows, however, that Polish influence appears to be reflected as the use of a *budu* + *l* future. If this is true, then the *budu* + Inf. type either arose independently in Ukrainian or was borrowed from Russian or Belarusian. At any rate, it appears that one of the steps of Rösler's proposed spread of the *budu* + Inf. future may not have taken place.

4.2.4 The Chronology of German werden

The chronological problems of the borrowing hypothesis are not restricted to the Slavic side of the equation. In his review of Rösler's article, Kurz (1952) is the first to point out errors regarding the development of the *werden* future in German. According to Kurz as well as Leiss (1985), Rösler is inaccurate when he states that the *werden*-future was available for borrowing as early as the thirteenth century. In reality, Leiss argues, examples of *werden* + Inf. are almost nonexistent before the thirteenth century, and the scattered examples from earlier texts have been characterized by some scholars as scribal errors (ibid.:257). With the earliest Czech examples dating from the thirteenth century, it is impossible to argue that *werden* + Inf. was already available for borrowing at an early enough time.

According to Leiss, Rösler also overlooks the very strong possibility that German actually borrowed its future construction from Czech. Supporting evidence includes the fact that Czech texts show the consistent use of be-futures far earlier than German texts show constructions of *werden* + Inf. (ibid.:258). Also, the spread of the German be-future was from the east to the west (ibid.:265-6). In her analysis, Leiss effectively demonstrates

that Rösler's initial assumption, that Slavic borrowed its be-future from the German construction with *werden*, is incorrect.

In this section, I have described the main points that have led some to conclude that the Slavic be-future originated as a borrowing. Given the amount of evidence that contradicts that position, we are left to demonstrate that the Slavic be-future construction developed from a native Slavic source. This is not a new idea – in the next section we will discuss a number of arguments that reach this conclusion – but it remains to be seen whether scholars have successfully described the process by which a be-future could have developed within Slavic.

5. Previous Scholarship: Alternatives to the Borrowing Hypothesis

For many scholars, there is no question that the Slavic be-future developed out of linguistic material native to Slavic. After all, Common Slavic can be shown to employ all the necessary components of the be-future constructions: a future auxiliary based on the verb 'be', a resultative participle with the formant *-l-* which can serve as the antecedent for the Polish future with the *l*-participle complement, and a precedent of analytic future tense constructions using the infinitive with various verbal auxiliaries. Common Slavic and the earliest attested Slavic languages also used a fairly diverse collection of future periphrases; Old Church Slavonic, Old Czech, and Old Russian, for example, all show a number of competing constructions. The essential problem to be solved, then, is in providing a description of how the situation reflected in the oldest texts evolved into the modern situation.

In the interest of space, I have selected two works to evaluate as representatives of the viewpoint that the be-future is a native Slavic construction: Lomtev (1952) and Křížková (1960). Both present detailed arguments which can be carefully analyzed.

5.1 Lomtev 1952

Although Lomtev discusses only the Russian be-future, his perspective is characteristic of the type of discussion one finds in earlier works on this issue. He argues that there are two possible sources of the Russian be-future (ibid.:251-2). The first possible source is the future perfect construction *budu* + *l*-participle, with the be-future developing via a replacement of *l*-participles by the infinitive. The second possible source is the future constructions which were in use in Old Russian with 'have', 'want', or 'begin'-type auxiliaries plus the infinitive. The required change would be a replacement of these auxiliaries by the auxiliary *budu*.

According to Lomtev (ibid.), only the first proposed path of development produces, or can produce, the proper outcome for modern Russian. By his way of thinking, the second proposed path is not possible. Whereas the earlier auxiliaries could combine with infinitives of either aspect, the be-auxiliary is only attested with imperfective infinitives. If the second path were the correct one, an intermediate stage is predicted where the be-auxiliary is attested with infinitives of both aspects. Since this intermediate stage is not found, Lomtev argues that the source for the modern Russian be-future must be the future perfect construction.

There are several flaws in Lomtev's argumentation. First, when describing the behavior of Old Russian future constructions prior to the be-future, he fails to make the distinction that phasal verbs, or verbs describing the beginning, continuation, or ending of

actions, do not combine with perfective infinitives in Slavic. While 'have' and 'want' auxiliaries did combine with infinitives of both aspects in Old Russian (Kuznecov 1959:234), inceptive auxiliaries are attested always with imperfective infinitives (ibid.:235). This distinction suggests that Lomtev's hypothesis is based on an initial assumption that is false.

Second, Lomtev's view of what constitutes syntactic change is unsophisticated by a more modern standard. Harris and Campbell (1995:50-ff.), for example, demonstrate that syntactic changes can be categorized into a small number of general types. Changes are not simply haphazard reshufflings of linguistic material, but rather are guided by the constraints of specific mechanisms like reanalysis and extension. In this sense, Lomtev's description of the reformulation of the Old Russian future perfect construction into the modern Russian future is inadequate. He does try to identify an intrasystemic trend – by tracing the be-future from the future perfect, he draws a link between the development of the *l*-participle into a past tense marker and the development of the be-future – but he does not, however, define an underlying mechanism at work.

Lomtev also is obliged to add a stipulation to his hypothesis stating that only imperfective *l*-participles were replaced by infinitives to form the modern be-future. Without this condition, one would again expect to find the be-auxiliary in combination with infinitives of either aspect. There is, however, no clear explanation for why *l*-participles of different aspects would develop in different ways. Lomtev is drawn to his conclusion only by his belief that the other possible path of development is impossible, as well as a desire to present the development of the future and past tenses as two sides of the same coin.

In summary, it appears that Lomtev rejects one possible path of development based on a suspect premise, and favors a hypothesis that seems considerably more problematic. Upon closer examination, the path of development that Lomtev rejects is actually a much more compelling hypothesis. In her book of only a few years later, Křížková (1960) presents an interesting argument linking the be-future with the previously used future constructions, especially those using auxiliaries from inceptive verbs.

5.2 Křížková 1960

The work of Křížková (1960) is the first to present a solution for the problem of why the be-future, unlike earlier future constructions, is used only with imperfective verbs. To explain this behavior, she quite correctly points out that one can see an analogue in phase verb constructions (ibid.:100). As mentioned above, phase verbs in Slavic combine with only imperfective infinitives. Moreover, inceptive verbs, such as those formed with the root *-čn-* 'begin', were used as future expressions from the earliest Slavic texts.

Given these facts, Křížková argues that the following process led to the genesis of the be-future. First, the present tense forms of 'begin'-type verbs came to be used as future auxiliaries. Such verbs retained their lexical meaning in other tenses, however, and thus Křížková argues that this made them unsuitable for use as purely grammatical markers. She claims that the be-auxiliary then came to be used because it made a more suitable future auxiliary, already free of other nuances (ibid.:101).

Křížková makes significant progress towards a comprehensive description of the development of the be-future; her insight in finding a connection between phase verbs and the be-auxiliary is essential to a satisfactory solution. There are, however, some problems with her hypothesis. Some of these are discussed by Kiparsky (1967:234-5) and do not

need to be reiterated here. In light of more recent scholarship, however, one particular error stands out.

A crucial part of Křížková's theory is her description of how the be-auxiliary came to be the regular future auxiliary. According to her argument, *budu* was used because it was a more suitable auxiliary in that it carried no lexical nuances. Such reasoning, however, contradicts what scholars have found on a cross-linguistic scale regarding the grammaticalization of verbs into auxiliaries. Bybee et al., for example, argue that in general, future auxiliaries develop from verbs whose meaning suggests a secondary implication of intention or prediction on the part of the speaker (1994:254). If this is the case, the older auxiliaries of 'have', 'want', and 'begin' were no less "suitable" for use as future markers than 'become'. Many languages, after all, employ futures that have developed from these verbs. Moreover, the be-auxiliary certainly existed as a fully lexical verb in its earliest stages, and there are similar instances of the grammaticalization of 'be(come)' in other languages (see section 4.2.1).

The use in Common Slavic of *budu* in a future perfect construction, however, appears to support Křížková's assumption that the auxiliary *budu* already existed in a usage free of nuances. But for many of the languages, there is doubt that the future perfect coexisted in time with the be-future.[5] In Old Church Slavonic, the future perfect is attested only seven times (Lunt 1974:99). Even in Polish, which employs be-futures with both infinitival and participial complements, the latter construction is extremely rare in the earliest texts (Górecka and Śmiech 1972:13). The use of the future perfect in Slavic has always been very limited, if only due to its semantics.

Ultimately, it may not be possible to explain why the be-auxiliary became the regular marker of the imperfective future, but only how. Křížková provides an important clue towards answering this question in her discussion of the similar behavior of inceptive verbs and the be-auxiliary, but does not pursue the discussion.

6. Conclusion

It is clear from examining the previous scholarship on the development of the Slavic be-future that an entirely satisfactory description of events has not yet been written. It has been argued convincingly that the be-future was not borrowed into Slavic from German, but there is as of yet no description of the evolution of the construction within Slavic that takes advantage of recent progress regarding the nature of morphosyntactic change. There are clues present in the work of Křížková 1960, however, that point towards a possible solution: her description of the analogical relationship between the be-future and phase verb constructions. I believe it is possible to show how *budu* could have undergone a semantic shift into a phasal verb capable of taking an imperfective infinitive complement,[6] but a comprehensive analysis remains to be done.

REFERENCES

Bonfante, G. 1950. The origin of the Russian periphrastic future. *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 10.87-98.

[5] For Russian, see Nikiforov 1952:182-3; for Czech, see Lehr-Spławiński 1957:141.

[6] Details can be found in Whaley 1998.

Bybee, Joan L., and Östen Dahl. 1989. The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. *Studies in language* 13.51-103.

Bybee, Joan L., and William Pagliuca. 1987. The evolution of future meaning. In *Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, eds. A. G. Ramat, O. Carruba, and G. Bernini, 109-22. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan L., William Pagliuca, and Revere Perkins. 1991. Back to the future. In *Approaches to grammaticalization*, eds. Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, 17-58. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

———. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cocron, Friedrich. 1962. *La langue russe dans la seconde moitié du XVIIe siécle (Morphologie)*. Parist: Institut d'Études Slaves.

Gebauer, Jan. 1909. *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. Vol. 3: Tvarosloví*. Prague: Unie.

Górecka, Janina, and Witold Śmiech. 1972. Czas przyszły złożony w języku polskim. *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego* 18, 11-38.

Harris, Alice C. and Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kiparsky, Valentin. 1967. *Russische historische Grammatik. Vol. 2*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Křížková, Helena. 1960. *Vývoj opisného futura v jazycích slovanských, zvláště v ruštině*. Prague: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství.

Kurz, J. 1952. Review of K. Rösler, Beobachtungen und Gedanken über das analytische Futurum im Slavischen, *Slavia* 25.153-4.

Kuznecov, P. S. 1959. *Očerki istoričeskoj morfologii russkogo jazyka*. Moscow: AN SSSR.

Lehr-Spławiński, Tadeusz. 1957. *Zarys gramatyki historycznej jẽzyka czeskiego*. 2nd ed. Warsaw: PWN.

Leiss, Elisabeth. 1985. Zur Entstehung des neuhochdeutschen analytischen Futurs. *Sprachwissenschaft* 10(3-4).250-73.

Lomtev, T. P. 1952. Ob upotreblenii glagola otnositel'no kategorii vremeni v drevne-russkom jazyke. *Russkij jazyk (Učenye zapiski MGU)* 150.219-53.

Lunt, Horace. 1974. *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*. 6th ed. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton.

Nikiforov, S. D. 1952. *Glagol: Ego kategorii i formy v russkoj pis'mennosti vtoroj poloviny XVI veka*. Moscow: AN SSSR.

Rösler, Karl. 1952. Beobachtungen und Gedanken über das analytische Futurum im Slavischen. *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 2.103-49.

Rospond, Stanisław. 1971. *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*. Warsaw: PWN.

Rusanivs'kij, V. M. 1971. *Struktura ukrains'koho dieslova*. Kiev: Naukova Dumka.

Šerech [-Shevelov], Yury. 1952. The Problem of Ukrainian-Polish Linguistic Relations from the Tenth to the Fourteenth Century. *Word* 8 (*Slavic Word* 1).329-49.

Ultan, Russell. 1978. The nature of future tenses. In *Universals of human language*, eds. Joseph Greenberg, Charles Ferguson, and Edith Moravcsik, 3: 83-123. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Whaley, Marika. 1998. The Origins of the Russian Imperfective Future Construction *budu* + Infinitive. Unpublished conference paper.

Zakrevska, Ja. V., et al. 1988. *Atlas ukrainskoi movy v tr'okh tomakh.* (Only two volumes completed.) Kiev: Naukova dumka.